

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,586	10/17/2001	Raymond J. Bergeron JR.	2134.2006-001	7212
21005	7590 06/16/2003			
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			EXAMINER	
530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			GERSTL, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			DATE MAILED: 06/16/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	09/981,586	BERGERON, RAYMOND J.			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Robert Gerstl	1626			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 A</u>	pril 2003 .				
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. <b>Disposition of Claims</b>					
4) Claim(s) <u>1-22 and 24-27</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19,26 and 27</u> is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>20-22,24 and 25</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received				
		on No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).					
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1.2	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/981,586 Page 2

Art Unit: 1626

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective (see 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414) because of the following: The amendment to claims 21, 22, 24, 25 putting them into independent form broadens the claim. Making the claim independent and free of the proviso now covers material that was not clearly and properly described in the specification nor covered in the issued patent.

2. Claims 21, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue oath under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the oath is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

The original patent, or a statement as to loss or inaccessibility of the original patent, must be received before this reissue application can be allowed. See 37 CFR 1.178.

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1626

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draeger. The 2<sup>nd</sup> prior art compound in column 5 is the racemic form of the compound of the claims and contains the instant S form. Applicants have not demonstrated any criticality of the chiral compound.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Gerstl whose telephone number is 703 308-4531. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe McKane can be reached on 703 308-4537. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 308-4426 for regular communications and 703 308-4426 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1235.

Application/Control Number: 09/981,586

Art Unit: 1626

Page 4

Robert Gersti

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1626

RG June 9, 2003